



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,232	12/07/2000	Parvathi Somashekar	5181-46501	7248

7590 04/05/2004

Robert C. Kowert  
Conley, Rose & Tayon, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER

MAURO JR, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004 4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PRG

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/733,232	SOMASHEKAR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Thomas J. Mauro Jr.	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-54 are pending and are presented for examination. A formal action on the merits of claims 1-54 follows.

#### *Priority*

2. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) as follows:

An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence of the specification of in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)). The specific reference to any prior nonprovisional application must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) between the applications except when the reference is to a prior application of a CPA assigned the same application number. **Oath/Declaration in Application does not specify the claim for priority to provisional application (60/169,719) under 35 U.S.C. 119(e). Priority must be stated in oath/declaration for priority to be granted.**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 8, 15, 17, 20-22, 29, 31, 34-36, 42, 44-46, 52 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Young (U.S. 6,560,606).

With respect to claim 1, Young teaches a method for configuring pluggable components, the method comprising:

configuring preference values for one pluggable component on a first device [Young -- **Figures 1 and 5, Col. 10 lines 4-11 and lines 43-51 and Col. 12 lines 55-58 – Pipeline stages and plug-ins parameter values are configured by user through configuration manager (150) residing on processing system (104), i.e. first device**]; and

distributing the pluggable component to one device via a network subsequent to said configuring [Young -- **Figure 3, Col. 2 lines 58-67, Col. 8 lines 27-33, Col. 10 lines 7-14 and Col. 13 lines 23-33 and lines 47-49 – Plug-in modules along with configuration files are created and distributed to the various pipeline stages residing with the execution management framework on the associated machines, i.e. computers/servers**];

wherein the pluggable components are executable within the other devices in accordance with the configured preference values to provide services to users of the other devices [Young --

**Col. 2 lines 46-67, Col. 8 lines 34-47 and Col. 13 lines 43-49 – Plug-ins are distributable to multiple machines along with the configuration file to execute a function which provides a service to a system].**

With respect to claim 2, Young further teaches receiving user input to a graphical user interface of the first device [Young -- Figure 5, Col. 3 lines 62-63, Col. 12 lines 55-58 and Col. 13 lines 9-11 – User interface, comprising menus and other input structures, i.e. graphical interface, is provided to users to configure stages and plug-ins]; and

modifying the preference values of a first pluggable component in accordance with the received user input [Young -- Col. 12 lines 51-67 and Col. 13 lines 1-21 – User, using graphical interface, modifies the parameter values, i.e. preferences, and configures the stages plug-ins].

With respect to claim 3, Young further teaches displaying on the graphical user interface [Young -- Col. 3 lines 61-63 and Col. 12 lines 55-58 - GUI] a current value of each of the preference values of the first pluggable component, wherein the received user input changes one or more of the displayed current values [Young -- Col. 12 lines 51-67 – Col. 13 lines 1-22 – Users modify/create configuration files, i.e. parameter/preference values, by using the user interface provided by the configuration manager. This requires the user interface to display the current configuration for the specified file to which the user can modify if he/she chooses].

With respect to claim 8, Young further teaches wherein said configuring preference values of one pluggable component on a first device comprises modifying one of the preference values of at least one pluggable component [Young -- Col. 2 lines 58-67 – Col. 3 lines 1-4 and Col. 10 lines 43-51 – All aspects of plug-ins can be configured, this includes adding, removing or modifying plug-ins, i.e. configuration files, to change values for the various parameters that control the behavior of the plug-ins].

With respect to claim 15, Young further teaches wherein each pluggable components comprises a preferences file comprising the preference values associated with the pluggable component [Young -- Figure 5, Col. 10 lines 4-14, Col. 12 lines 59-63 and Col. 14 lines 46-49 – Configuration file, i.e. preference file, holds information and parameters/values which direct the operation of the plug-ins and how the plug-ins behave].

With respect to claim 17, Young further teaches wherein each device comprises an embedded server, wherein the pluggable component is executable within the embedded server of each device [Young -- Figure 3 – Machine 302, 304 and/or 306, Figure 5 and Col. 13 lines 23-49 – Execution management frameworks, i.e. embedded server component, is responsible for providing the infrastructure to allow the plug-ins to operate, i.e. execute].

With respect to claim 20, Young further teaches wherein the network is the Internet [Young -- Figure 3, Col. 8 lines 48-52, Col. 10 lines 9-14, Col. 13 lines 47-49 and Col. 17

**lines 16-21 – Plug-ins along with configuration files are distributed to multiple machines over a network, i.e. the Internet, using HTTP].**

With respect to claim 21, Young teaches a system comprising:

a first device [Young -- **Figure 1A and 5, Col. 4 lines 47-61 and Col. 10 lines 4-11 and 43-51 – Processing system (104), i.e. first device**]; and

a plurality of devices operable to couple to the first device via a network [Young -- **Figure 3, Col. 8 lines 48-52, Col. 10 lines 4-14 and Col. 13 lines 43-49 – Machines are interconnected via a network which allows the plug-ins to be distributed from processing system, which contains configuration manager, to the various machines via HTTP on the network**];

wherein the first device is configured to:

configure preference values for a plurality of pluggable components in accordance with user input [Young -- **Figures 1 and 5, Col. 3 lines 62-63, Col. 10 lines 4-11 and lines 43-51, Col. 12 lines 55-58 and Col. 13 lines 9-11 – Pipeline stages and plug-in parameter values are configured by the user through configuration manager (150), residing on processing system (104), i.e. first device, which provides the user with a graphical user interface**]; and

distribute the plurality of pluggable components to the plurality of devices via the network subsequent to said configuring and in response to user input [Young -- **Figure 3, Col. 2 lines 58-67, Col. 8 lines 27-33, Col. 10 lines 7-14, Col. 12 lines 55-67 – Col. 13 lines 1-21 and Col. 13 lines 23-33 and lines 47-49 – Plug-in modules along with**

**configuration files are created and distributed to the various pipeline stages residing with the execution management framework on the associated machines, i.e. computers/servers. All configuration aspects, including layout, are configured by user. This requires the user to additionally specify the machines to which the plug-in is to be distributed]; and**

wherein the plurality of pluggable components are executable within the plurality of devices in accordance with the configured preference values to provide services to users of the plurality of devices [Young -- Col. 2 lines 46-67, Col. 8 lines 34-47 and Col. 13 lines 43-49 – **Plug-ins are distributable to multiple machines along with the configuration file to execute a function which provides a service to a system].**

With respect to claim 22, Young further teaches wherein the first device is further configured to:

display in a graphical user interface [Young -- Col. 3 lines 61-63 and Col. 12 lines 55-58 - **GUI]** on the display component a current value of each of the preference values of a first of the plurality of pluggable components [Young -- Col. 12 lines 51-67 – Col. 13 lines 1-22 – **Users modify/create configuration files, i.e. parameter/preference values, by using the user interface provided by the configuration manager. This requires the user interface to display the current configuration for the specified file to which the user can modify if he/she chooses];**

receive user input to the graphical user interface changing one of the displayed current values [Young -- Figure 5, Col. 3 lines 62-63, Col. 12 lines 55-58 and Col. 13 lines 9-11 –



**User interface, comprising menus and other input structures, i.e. graphical interface, is provided to users to configure stages and plug-ins, i.e. change current preference values]; and**

**modify the preference values of the first pluggable component in accordance with the received user input [Young -- Col. 12 lines 51-67 and Col. 13 lines 1-21 -- User, using graphical interface, modifies the parameter values, i.e. preferences, and configures the stages plug-ins].**

With respect to claims 29, 31 and 34, these are system claims corresponding to the method claimed in claims 15, 17 and 20 above. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 29, 31 and 34 are rejected under the same rationale.

With respect to claim 35, Young teaches a device comprising:

**a memory configured to store program instructions [Young -- Figure 7 and Col. 16 lines 52-67 -- Col. 17 lines 1-3 and lines 22-38 -- Memory stores software, i.e. program instructions, for carrying out operations of device];**

**an input device configured to receive user input [Young -- Figure 7 and Col. 17 lines 4-15 -- Input devices include keyboard, mouse etc.]; and**

**a processor configured to read the program instructions from the memory and to execute the program instructions, wherein, in response to execution of the program instructions, the processor is operable to [Young Figure 7, Col. 16 lines 51-52 and Col. 17 lines 22-55 --**

Art Unit: 2143

**Processor enables the execution of software instructions to carry out operations of the device]:**

configure preference values for one pluggable component on the device in accordance with received user input [Young -- Figures 1 and 5, Col. 3 lines 62-63, Col. 10 lines 4-11 and lines 43-51, Col. 12 lines 55-58 and Col. 13 lines 9-11 – Pipeline stages and plug-in parameter values are configured by the user through configuration manager (150), residing on processing system (104), i.e. first device, which provides the user with a graphical user interface]; and

distribute the pluggable component to one other device via a network subsequent to said configuring and in response to user input [Young -- Figure 3, Col. 2 lines 58-67, Col. 8 lines 27-33, Col. 10 lines 7-14, Col. 12 lines 55-67 – Col. 13 lines 1-21 and Col. 13 lines 23-33 and lines 47-49 – Plug-in modules along with configuration files are created and distributed to the various pipeline stages residing with the execution management framework on the associated machines, i.e. computers/servers. All configuration aspects, including layout, are configured by user. This requires the user to additionally specify the machines to which the plug-in is to be distributed];

wherein the pluggable components are executable within the other devices in accordance with the configured preference values to provide services to users of the one or more other devices [Young -- Col. 2 lines 46-67, Col. 8 lines 34-47 and Col. 13 lines 43-49 – Plug-ins are distributable to multiple machines along with the configuration file to execute a function which provides a service to a system].

With respect to claim 36, Young further teaches:

a display component **[Young -- Figure 7 and Col. 17 lines 13-15 – Visual display is produced by video controller].**

The remaining limitations in claim 36 are similar to the limitations of claim 22. Therefore, claim 36 is rejected under the same rationale.

With respect to claims 42 and 44, these are device claims corresponding to the method claimed in claims 15 and 20 above. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 42 and 44 are rejected under the same rationale.

With respect to claim 45, Young teaches a carrier medium comprising program instruction, wherein the program instructions are computer-executable to implement **[Young -- Figure 7 and Col. 16 lines 52-67 – Col. 17 lines 1-3 and lines 22-38 – Memory stores software, i.e. program instructions, for carrying out operations of device]:**

configuring preference values for one pluggable component **[Young -- Figures 1 and 5, Col. 10 lines 4-11 and lines 43-51 and Col. 12 lines 55-58 – Pipeline stages and plug-ins parameter values are configured by user through configuration manager (150) residing on processing system (104)]; and**

distributing the one pluggable component to one device via a network subsequent to said configuring **[Young -- Figure 3, Col. 2 lines 58-67, Col. 8 lines 27-33, Col. 10 lines 7-14 and Col. 13 lines 23-33 and lines 47-49 – Plug-in modules along with configuration files are**

**created and distributed to the various pipeline stages residing with the execution management framework on the associated machines, i.e. computers/servers];**

wherein the one pluggable component is executable within the one device in accordance with the configured preference values to provide services to users of the device [Young -- Col. 2 lines 46-67, Col. 8 lines 34-47 and Col. 13 lines 43-49 – Plug-ins are distributable to multiple machines along with the configuration file to execute a function which provides a service to a system].

With respect to claim 46, this is a carrier medium claim corresponding to the system claimed in claim 22. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 46 is rejected under the same rationale.

With respect to claims 52 and 54, these are carrier medium claims corresponding to the method claimed in claims 17 and 20 above. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 52 and 54 are rejected under the same rationale.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young (U.S. 6,560,606), as applied to claim 2 above, in view of Hammond (U.S. 6,637,020).

Regarding claim 4, Young teaches the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 2 above, but fails to teach validating received user input before modifying a value.

Hammond, however teaches input validation of data entry fields [**Hammond -- Col. 9 lines 66-67 – Col. 10 lines 1-5**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the validation of data entry fields, as taught by Hammond into the invention of Young, in order to provide fault tolerance to ensure that proper values are entered into the proper fields so as not to cause errors during execution.

7. Claims 5-7, 23, 37 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young (U.S. 6,560,606), as applied to claims 1, 5, 21, 35 and 45 above respectively, in view of Barrett et al. (U.S. 6,611,876).

Regarding claim 5, Young teaches the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including modifying preference values of a first pluggable component in accordance with the received user input [**Young -- Col. 12 lines 51-67 and Col. 13 lines 1-21 -- User, using graphical interface, modifies the parameter values, i.e. preferences, and configures the stages plug-ins**].

Young fails to teach receiving user input to a command line interface.

Barrett, however, discloses using a command line interface to alter or modify preference information of a MEG, i.e. plug-in [**Barrett -- Col. 4 lines 50-64 -- Command line interface is used to modify preference information of MEG, i.e. plug-in, when it is authored**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the receiving of user inputs via a command line interface to modify preferences of a MEG, i.e. plug-in, as taught by Barrett into the invention of Young, in order to provide more experienced users with the ability to employ more powerful sequences of commands in addition to providing a convenient implementation for making changes.

Regarding claim 6, Young-Barrett teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 5 above, wherein the received user input [**Barrett -- Col. 4 lines 58-64 -- In order to modify/alter preferences through a command line interface, inputs must be received**] specifies one preference value of the first pluggable component and a new value for the specified preference values [**Young -- Figures 1 and 5, Col. 10 lines 4-11 and lines 43-51 and Col. 12 lines 55-58 -- Pipeline stages and plug-ins parameter values are configured by**

**user through configuration manager (150) residing on processing system (104). The user is free to specify the various values for each parameter].**

Regarding claim 23, this is a system claim corresponding to the method claimed in claims 5 and 6. It has similar limitations; therefore claim 23 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 37, this is a device claim corresponding to the method claimed in claims 5 and 6. It has similar limitations; therefore claim 37 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 47, this is a carrier medium claim corresponding to the method claimed in claims 5 and 6. It has similar limitations; therefore claim 47 is rejected under the same rationale.

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young (U.S. 6,560,606) and Barrett et al. (U.S. 6,611,876), as applied to claim 5 above, in view of Hammond (U.S. 6,637,020).

Regarding claim 7, Young-Barrett-Hammond teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 5 above, further comprising validating the received user input [**Hammond -- Col. 9 lines 66-67 – Col. 10 lines 1-5 – User input into data entry fields are validated to ensure proper type of data has been entered].**

Art Unit: 2143

9. Claims 9, 24, 38 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young (U.S. 6,560,606), as applied to claims 1, 21, 35 and 45 above respectively, in view of Foltan et al. (U.S. 6,667,972).

Regarding claim 9, Young teaches the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, but fails to teach initializing each of the preference values to a default value prior to configuring.

Foltan, however, discloses initializing parameter values to a default before any configuring of preferences takes place [**Foltan -- Col. 26 lines 45-49 – Parameters values are initialized with a default set of values which can be later modified and configured by the user**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the initializing of preference values to default values, as taught by Foltan into the invention of Young, in order to allow for easier configuration by placing typical or common values for the various parameters to alleviate the user from having to configure all parameters, for example, parameters that typically will not need to be changed.

Regarding claim 24, this is a system claim corresponding to the method claimed in claims 8 and 9. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 24 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 38, this is a device claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 9. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 38 is rejected under the same rationale.



Regarding claim 48, this is a carrier medium claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 9. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 48 is rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claims 10-12, 25-26, 39-40 and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young (U.S. 6,560,606), as applied to claims 1, 21, 35 and 45 above respectively, in view of Semenzato (U.S. 5,903,728).

Regarding claim 10, Young teaches the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, but fails to teach wherein the plurality of pluggable components are copies of a first pluggable component.

Semenzato, however, discloses creating duplicate copies of plug-in components from a single plug-in component [**Semenzato -- Col. 3 lines 46-54 and Col. 6 lines 18-42 – Duplicate plug-in controller is created**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate duplicating or copying of plug-ins, as taught by Semenzato into the invention of Young, in order to facilitate the reuse of a component in multiple machines or environments.

Regarding claim 11, Young-Semenzato teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 10 above, wherein the other devices are a plurality of devices [**Young -- Figure 3, Col. 2 lines 58-67, Col. 8 lines 27-33, Col. 10 lines 7-14 and Col. 13 lines 23-33 and lines 47-49 – Plug-in modules along with configuration files are created and distributed to**

Art Unit: 2143

**the various pipeline stages residing with the execution management framework on the associated machines, i.e. computers/servers, also known as plural devices], wherein said configuring preference values comprise modifying the preference values for each of the plurality of pluggable components [Young -- Col. 12 lines 51-67 and Col. 13 lines 1-21 – User, using graphical interface, modifies the parameter values, i.e. preferences, and configures the stages plug-ins] for execution within a corresponding one of the plurality of devices [Young -- Col. 2 lines 46-67, Col. 8 lines 34-47 and Col. 13 lines 43-49 – Plug-ins are distributable to multiple machines, i.e. devices, along with the configuration file to execute a function on the system].**

Regarding claim 12, Young-Semenzato teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 11 above, wherein said distributing comprises sending each of the plurality of pluggable components to the corresponding one of the plurality of devices via a network [Young -- Figure 3 and Col. 8 lines 48-58, Col. 13 lines 43-49 and Col. 17 lines 16-21 – Plug-ins are distributed across multiple machines via the network that connects the machines and system together using HTTP].

Regarding claims 25 and 26, these are system claims corresponding to the method claimed in claims 10-11 and 12 respectively. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 25 and 26 and 39 and 40 are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claims 39 and 40, these are device claims corresponding to the method claimed in claims 10-11 and 12 respectively. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 39 and 40 are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claims 49 and 50, these are carrier medium claims corresponding to the method claimed in claims 10-11 and 12 respectively. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 49 and 50 are rejected under the same rationale.

11. Claims 13-14, 27-28, 41 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young (U.S. 6,560,606), as applied to claims 1, 13, 21, 27, 35 and 45 above respectively, in view of Davis et al. (U.S. 5,742,829).

Regarding claim 13, Young teaches the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, including modifying information associated with a plug-in component, which includes receiving user input specifying the component and the preference values to modify [Young -- Col. 12 lines 51-67 and Col. 13 lines 1-21 -- User, using graphical interface, modifies the parameter values, i.e. preferences, and configures the stages plug-ins. In order to configure a plug-in, the user must specify which plug-in he wants to configure by either selecting it or loading it].

Young fails to teach generating a batch file comprising one or more configuration entries for the

one or more pluggable components and executing the batch file, wherein each of the configuration entries sets the specified preference value for the specified pluggable component to the new value of the configuration entry when executed.

Davis, however, teaches a method of configuration computer systems which executes a batch file to automatically configure, i.e. setup programs, natural language, etc, various heterogeneous computer systems by carrying out the commands/instructions specified within the batch file

**[Davis -- Col. 11 lines 50-67, Col. 12 lines 61-67 – Col. 13 lines 1-38 – System executes batch file, which obviously was generated previously. This batch file allows the heterogeneous computer systems to be configured by executing the commands to configure the machines].**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the generation and execution of a batch file to configure computer systems, as taught by Davis into the invention of Young, in order to facilitate and automate the process of installing software and configuring heterogeneous computer systems across a network.

Regarding claim 14, Young-Davis teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 13 above, including distributing pluggable components to multiple machines over the network **[Young -- Figure 3 and Col. 8 lines 48-58, Col. 13 lines 43-49 and Col. 17 lines 16-21 – Plug-ins are distributed across multiple machines via the network that connects the machines and system together using HTTP. This requires that the destination, i.e. IP address, computer name, etc., of the plug-in must be specified by the user in order for it to get to the proper location]** by executing a batch file containing these commands **[Davis -- Col. 11 lines 50-67, Col. 12 lines 61-67 – Col. 13 lines 1-38 – System**

Art Unit: 2143

**executes batch file that executes a series of commands, specified in the file, to configure heterogeneous computer systems].**

Therefore, it would have been obvious to package the commands necessary to distribute the plug-ins into a batch file for execution to automate and facilitate the process of distributing components to multiple machines.

Regarding claims 27-28, these are system claims corresponding to the method claimed in claims 13-14. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 27-28 are rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 41, this is a device claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 13. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 41 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 51, this is a carrier medium claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 13. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 51 is rejected under the same rationale.

12. Claims 16, 18, 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young (U.S. 6,560,606), as applied to claims 15, 16, 21 and 31 above respectively, in view of Lawrence (U.S. 6,629,113).

Regarding claim 16, Young teaches the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 15 above, but fails to explicitly teach the preference/configuration files are JAVA® property files.

Lawrence, however, discloses that configuration, i.e. preference, files used to store variables which obviously have values associated with them are stored in JAVA® property files

**[Lawrence -- Col. 7 lines 38-46].**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the storing of configuration/preference files in JAVA® property files, as taught by Lawrence into the invention of Young, in order to utilize the storage facility for preference information provided in the underlying programming language.

Regarding claim 18, Young-Lawrence teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 16 above, including an embedded server **[Young -- Figure 3 – Machine 302, 304 and/or 306, Figure 5 and Col. 13 lines 23-49 – Execution management frameworks, i.e. embedded server component, is responsible for providing the infrastructure to allow the plug-ins to operate, i.e. execute]**, but fail to teach a JAVA® embedded server.

Young teaches that both the plug-ins and the execution framework can be implemented using Object Oriented Programming (OOP) **[Young -- Col. 17 lines 56-67 – Col. 18 lines 1-8].**

It was notoriously well known at the time of the applicant's invention that JAVA® was a common and widely used Object Oriented programming language.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the JAVA® as the OOP language for the plug-ins and framework in order to capture the portability it provides and the powerful concepts of encapsulation, polymorphism and inheritance.

Regarding claims 30 and 32, these are system claims corresponding to the method claimed in claims 16 and 18 above. They have similar limitations; therefore, claims 30 and 32 are rejected under the same rationale.

13. Claims 19, 33, 43 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young (U.S. 6,560,606), as applied to claims 1, 21, 35 and 45 above respectively, in view of Muschett et al. (U.S. 6,026,437).

Regarding claim 19, Young teaches the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1 above, but fails to teach wherein the pluggable components are JAVA Archive (JAR) files.

Muschett, however, teaches bundling a pluggable component, i.e. an applet, as a JAR file **[Muschett -- Figure 7 and Col. 9 lines 8-26]**.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the bundling of an applet, i.e. pluggable component, as a JAR file, as taught by Muschett into the invention of Young, in order to take advantage of packaging concepts and

Art Unit: 2143

decreased download time by utilizing compression software and a single transmission connection.

Regarding claim 33, this is a system claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 19. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 33 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 43, this is a device claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 19. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 43 is rejected under the same rationale.

Regarding claim 53, this is a carrier medium claim corresponding to the method claimed in claim 19. It has similar limitations; therefore, claim 53 is rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Braun et al. (U.S. 6,636,961) discloses a method of configuring personal computer systems by running a batch file to provide configuration information.
- Baer et al. (U.S. 6,366,916) discloses a system for configuring plug-in property and behavior values.



- Brandt et al. (U.S. 5,875,327) discloses a system and method for configuring workstation preferences.
- Taylor (U.S. 5,721,824) discloses a system for multi-package distribution software.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mauro Jr. whose telephone number is 703-605-1234. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
TJM

March 31, 2004

  
DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100